

104. What recommendations do you have for Project Edison going forward?

Wave 1

1. na
2. Communicate.
3. Find the resources to have continued access to the ERP modules contractors until Wave 3 is at least 3 mo into implementation.
4. Give us more time to correct problems in Edison before year end close.
5. Streamline old procedures into newer more efficient procedures for procurement and requisitions
6. Expand training beyond simple PeopleSoft navigation. Develop procedures manuals that show how to carry out the necessary State business processes using the PeopleSoft software.
7. *Focus on system performance/processing times *add PO link to PO approval screens (similar to voucher link)
8. Realize the shortcomings of the current version and listen to the agencies without criticizing the users. We are putting in lots of extra hours to try and make it work. Work to improve the functionality and stability of the system.

Wave 2

1. Fire Stephanie Richardson and most of the upper level management personnel. Hire more people who know the day to day work of the agencies.
2. I like the new system. Although, there are some weaknesses to work out I feel that it's a much better system than STARS and TOPS. Employees are reimbursed much faster for travel, and vendors are paid much faster for Invoices. Although the approval process is rather lengthy I have no issues with the Edison system. This is the 21st century and technology is progressing daily.
3. the training isn't valuable if it is not hands on, actually doing. Showing us how to do it is not enough.
4. If modifications to the system are necessary to provide agencies with the tools they need to accurately process the state's transactions and accurately monitor the state's budget, then modifications should be considered.
5. None.

6. Workshops everyday in the procurement area, every other day in the payables area, and weekly in other areas. Agencies need more Edison support.
7. Refine to meet user needs
8. Need ongoing training classes and at least a limited full-time workshop for procurement and accounts payable.
9. The training needs to be more "hands-on real situation" rather than clicking through a screen show on the computer with a teacher reading verbatim from the manual that was simply print-screened from the screen show. Rather than basing task profiles and travel on the employee, it should be tied to the position itself. (Additionally, a field to reference the old Legacy position numbers should be added as those #s had a meaningful sequencing to them where as the new Edison #s are random.) Many employees move around in state employment and this has caused many problems with getting payroll and travel to the appropriate accounting (cost centers.) The costs generated are due to the functions of the position. And along those lines, it seems ridiculous that the payroll accounting query for fiscal directors is housed under the HCM module that is not accessible by Fiscal Directors. What value is that? Many of the modules have added too many steps to accomplish a simple task. Also, many of the functions should be sent back to the agency to handle. Examples being: deleting an attached file from a payable/journal transaction that is incorrect. (The help desk does not work these requests in a timely fashion whatsoever. Therefore my staff are simply attaching the correct file, leaving the incorrect attached and basically doubling the size of the memory required to store that transaction. Since speedcharts are agency specific, the agency should be allowed to name them so that they have some meaningful relationship to the accounting being represented. The random numbering system leaves lots of room for error. Agencies should also be allowed to adjust the task profiles for positions. We've not been successful in getting 1/3 of our staff into the correct profiles, even after multiples submissions of the "Edison task profile change forms," which has caused tremendous amounts of correcting journal entries and wasted employee time that could have been better spent. The approval system takes far too much time than it did in STARS. An effort to refine that should be made. And the notification process is a pain to deal with, constantly having to email the other party that there is work pending. Why can't such a sophisticated system do some of that automatically? Each day a new glitch seems to appear so this recommendation for change could be added to constantly.
10. Work closely with the agencies (in small groups) to address issues each agency is having. Communicate with agencies as much as possible and continue to offer workshops on an on-going basis to enhance training. Help form an agency user group so that agencies can exchange information with each other.
11. Get the help desk better trained to resolve issues more and transferring them to others to follow-up less.

12. Because Edison is going from a development to operational mode, does not mean that they can just drop responsibility onto State department and agencies. This transition is going to take time and support should be available for as long as necessary.
13. Please see response to the fifth question back.
14. Slow down, I believe this projected was pushed on the agency to quickly. All financial components should not have come out at the same time, to many problems. HR problems were not even corected.
15. Stop blaming the agencies for "lack of training" and "reluctance to learn a new system". The system has its flaws and it is obvious that Edison is a software designed for the private sector and was "patched" for government use.
16. I have more recommendations for F&A and General Services than I do for Edison.
17. To make sure Agencies coming on board are adequately trained, and to make sure any system bugs are worked out both to ensure Wave 1 and Wave 2 agencies are operating as smoothly as possible, and to ensure a smoother start up for Wave 3. Also, to make sure agencies are properly trained on how to make role mapping/security changes as employees change functions or new employees take their places.
18. Focus on how to survive? It is already June 4. How can we close when we don't know where we are or how much we have in the pocket? You can pay bills all day long. But, do you know lots of IUs and front-end billings have not been billed? Hold on to July 1, Wave 3 Implementation.
19. More visible support and joint problem resolution is needed from the Division of Accounts. Many of the functional requirements are dictated by them. Better reporting is a must. Also, there needs to be some improvement in the amount of time it takes to make this system work.
20. Staff up to support transition issues resolution--which is a challenge in the current budget situation.
21. Provide standardized reports

Wave 3

1. I would like to see us keep HCM and focus on repairing the problems in that area. I do not see how FSCM will ever be functional.
2. Ensure that all issues are adequately resolved and tested prior to implementation.
3. Allow for more time. Insure that staff feels confident with implementation. Most importantly, there should be better communication the "how to" of various business processes and less time spent on how to navigate through the system. Navigation is not a big issue. Successful processing is a big issue.

4. I would like Edison to really sit with each agency and go through the role mapping together so that we have a better understanding of the roles and the staff necessary to complete the role processes. I would like Edison have several group meetings where they can explain to the agencies by using examples on role mappings and offer suggestions of how to set up the information rather than be vague, tell agencies to set it up the way we do business and then look at it and tell us it is not right. We are also being pressured to give accounting information back to Edison that should have been requested months ago but only received the request two days ago.
5. Edison and F&A leadership need to take responsibility for the weaknesses and fix them. Instead, they continue to blame the employees who are forced to use a subpar system. As a state, we need to progress to a modern platform...but it needs to be done the right way.
6. The overall understanding of Edison needs to be improved. Contrary to previous statements, Edison is not an integrated system. HCM, Fleet and Financials are three different systems. While there may be understanding of these three systems by different individuals, there isn't an understanding of how they work together. Interfaces between Fleet and Peoplesoft are suspect or not working.
7. Keeping the workshops and conference calls going for a while after go live. They also need to be prepared for offering whatever help the agencies will need to get past any problems quickly. The help desk must be ready to help and help fast.
8. Better communication and not treat the agencies as though we are the enemy
9. Complete adequate parallel testing of required interfaces. Perform more meaningful trainings of real life transactions. Finally, more completely develop practical management reporting tools.
10. Consultation should have occurred prior to final system configuration. Recommend that system changes occur to accommodate different business processes.
11. The state of Tennessee is in a very difficult situation. About half of the agencies are now using Edison, whereas the largest agencies are still using STARS. It seems that reverting back to STARS, SEIS, etc. would be extremely difficult. Considering all of this, I suggest that Edison go forward as planned on July 1st, or that it be delayed for a short period of time to allow some of the most pressing issues to be resolved. After go live, and after wave 3 agencies have used the system for a few months, a full audit / review of the system should be performed. If necessary, the process to replace Edison with a new system should be initiated. In addition, I have noticed several issues with Edison that seem to revert back to the bureaucratic business practices that are used by the State of Tennessee. I highly recommend that the senior executives of F&A, General Services, and other high-level officials take a honest look at these practices, and make changes as needed. I don't see any system being able to be efficient when considering the layers of red-tape that this state has.